

RE: H.B. No. 5397 AN ACT DECLARING GUN VIOLENCE A PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS AND ESTABLISHING THE OFFICE OF GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND ADVISORY COUNCIL ON GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION.

S.B. No. 477 AN ACT CONCERNING THE PUBLIC HEALTH OF RESIDENTS OF THE STATE.

Dear Co-Chair Daugherty-Abrams, Co-Chair Steinberg, Vice Chair Anwar, Vice Chair Kushner, Vice Chair Gilchrest, Ranking Member Hwang, Ranking Member Somers, Ranking Member Petit, and other distinguished members of the Public Health Committee

Section 7 of SB 477 is an insult to the citizens of Connecticut. You are attempting to tack on an agenda, "gun violence" to established known medical diseases (Alzheimer's and mental issues which surround pregnancy). Section 7 is such a blatant attempt to restrict the rights of law-abiding citizens, and, with the history of the administration, I suspect less would be devoted to the medical diseases and more to your social agenda. Furthermore, the cost of funding section seven would be duplication of other related programs.

SB 477 is not a disaster and without much of section 7, is addressing in the proper manner some issues that may be affecting our population.

HB 5397 is an attack on those who choose to exercise their rights under both the US and Connecticut Constitutions. You are targeting violence based on the weapon used and not addressing the causes of violence. You are equating the taking of someone's own life, (suicide), with that of taking another (homicide). If two thirds of firearm related deaths are suicide, would it not be more appropriate to address that aspect, which is mental health?

Senate Majority Leader Schumer, when speaking about voting rights, said that when the state legislators' game the system, then that is gaming the outcome. When you create an advisory council staffed by people who live to restrict the rights of law-abiding citizens whose only offense is exercising their rights, what outcome would you expect? Would there be a fair and balanced discussion, or would you simply be focused on using smoke and mirrors, paid for by the taxpayer, to reach your

foregone conclusion? HB5397 simply games the system and attempts to add legitimacy to a corrupt process. To make it more consensus driven you would need to have an equal number of lobbyists/advocates from each sector plus disclosure of their funding/lobbying efforts. I equate advocacy and lobbying in the same breath.

It can be argued that more deaths are the results of voting than any other cause. How we vote does result in the election of people who 1) go to war 2) decide how to manage a pandemic 3) devote money to medical research etc. So why do you not create a task force to look at voting?

HB5397 should be scrapped, and the state should focus on the plethora of existing programs which exist to help people as opposed to spending money to deprive the most law-abiding sector of their rights.

Morris Armstrong

Prospect CT